

JUDGMENT

FILED: June 7

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

for the

Fourth Circuit

No. 05-1549
CA-01-103-BEL-1

JAIME GARCIA; ELVIRA GARCIA

Plaintiffs - Appellants

v.

RONALD D. KIRSTIEN, O'Stein Brothers L.P. No. 4; HARVEY
ROTHSTEIN, O'Stein Brothers L.P. No. 4; RANDY HABECK

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
District of Maryland at Baltimore

In accordance with the written opinion of this Court filed
this day, the Court affirms the judgment of the District Court
A certified copy of this judgment will be provided to the
District Court upon issuance of the mandate. The judgment
take effect upon issuance of the mandate.

/s/ Patricia S. Connor

CLERK

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1549

JAIME GARCIA; ELVIRA GARCIA,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

RONALD D. KIRSTIEN, O'Stein Brothers L.P. No
4; HARVEY ROTHSTEIN, O'Stein Brothers L.P. No
4; RANDY HABECK,

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson Everett Legg, Chief District Judge. (CA-01-103-BEL-1)

Submitted: April 28, 2006

Decided June 7 2006

Before WILLIAMS, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion

David F. Albright, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellants. Craig David Roswell, Matthew A. Swartz, NILES, BARTON & WILMER, L.L.P., Baltimore, Maryland; Patrick John Kearney, SELZER, GURVITCH, RABIN & OBENCY, CHTD., Bethesda, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jaime and Elvira Garcia appeal from the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of the Defendants and denying their motion to alter or amend the judgment. We have reviewed the parties' briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court's opinion and orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. See Garcia v. Kirstien, No. CA-01-103-BEL-1 (D. Md. filed Sept. 30, 2004 & entered Oct. 1, 2004; filed Apr. 8, 2005 & entered Apr. 11, 2005). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process

AFFIRMED